

Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahagirdar in view of Koizumi and U.S. Patent No. 5,896,575 to Higginbotham et al. (hereinafter Higginbotham).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and requests reexamination in view of the following remarks.

Koizumi discloses a method for driving a liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal panel which has a pair of substrates facing each other with a liquid crystal layer interposed there between and respectively having signal electrodes and scanning electrodes which are located perpendicular to each other. See, for example, Koizumi Abstract.

In the Examiner's July 3<sup>rd</sup> Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Koizumi includes a memory 31, an operation circuit 32, a function generating circuit 33, a driving voltage circuit 14, first and second distortion correction circuits 23 and 25, first and second signal electrode driving circuits 13 and 15, and first and second scanning electrode driving circuits 21 and 22. See, for example, July 3<sup>rd</sup> Office Action, page 6.

However, and assuming *arguendo* that the combination of the ten listed items asserted by the Examiner would teach or suggest at least the above claimed feature of Applicant's invention, it is not proper to make such a combination under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Clearly, the single "operator" of the claimed invention is not taught in the combination of at least ten items from Koizumi. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 13 and 20 and claims 14-19 and 21-26, which depend from claims 13 and 20, respectively, are allowable over the cited reference.

Dependent claim 18, which depends from independent claim 13, therefore, incorporates all the limitations of claim 13. However, as explained above, Koizumi does not teach the claimed invention recited in at least independent claims 13 and 20. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, dependent claim 18, which depends from independent claim 13 is also allowable over the cited reference.

Dependent claim 25, which depends from independent claim 20, and therefore, incorporates all the limitations of claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least for at least the foregoing reasons, dependent claim 25, is allowable over the cited reference.

The Examiner rejects claims 15-17 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koizumi in view of Jahagirdar. For similar reasons as discussed above, Koizumi does not teach or suggest the above claimed invention. Furthermore, Jahagirdar fails to cure the deficiencies of Koizumi.

Although the Jahagirdar reference discloses a display controller 504, as shown in Fig. 5, this display controller “selects one of the drivers 514 or 518 to receive display data through a line 526 (for driver 514) or a line 532 (for driver 518), and sends the display data via a bus 528 coupled to both of the drivers 514 and 518. See, for example, column 4, lines 34-39. Clearly, the portable communication device of Jahagirdar includes two specific drivers, one for a first display area 130 and a second driver for a second display area 132. See, for example, Abstract.

Furthermore, the multiplicity of components would not render the claimed invention obvious for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to independent claims 13 and 20.

Accordingly, Koizumi in view of Jahagirdar does not teach or suggest a combination of elements, including, for example, “an operator for operating the first and second liquid crystal displays having a plurality of scanned electrodes lines connected to the first and second scan electrodes,” as recited in independent claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 15-17 and 22-24, which depend from independent claims 13 and 20, respectively, are allowable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the additional features from independent claims 15-17 and 22-24.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under Jahagirdar in view of Koizumi and Higginbotham. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. For at least the reasons discussed above, neither Koizumi or Jahagirdar teach or suggest the claimed invention. Furthermore, Higginbotham fails to make-up the deficiencies of Koizumi and/or Jahagirdar.

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of the claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 and dependent claims 2-6 and 8-12, which depend from independent claims 1 and 7, are allowable over the cited references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-14, 19-21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Koizumi; 18 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Koizumi; 15 and 17 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Koizumi with Jahagirdar; and 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Jahagirdar in combination with Koizumi and Higginbotham.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: October 31, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Song K. Jung

Registration No.: 35,210

William D. Titcomb

Registration No.: 46,463

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant



30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE